DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 255 SP 036 985

AUTHOR Bradshaw, Lynn K.
TITLE Alternative Teacher Performance Appraisal in North Carolina: Developing Guidelines.
PUB DATE Jan 96
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; Public School Teachers; State Standards; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina; Teaching Performance Tests

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this document is to assist members of the North Carolina Professional Practices Commission in the development of guidelines for teacher evaluation. The paper reviews the historical development of teacher performance appraisal and the implementation of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) starting in the mid-1980s. Although implementation of TPAI brought a number of positive changes to the way teacher performance was evaluated and to the interaction among teachers, principals, and other evaluators in the school setting, a number of concerns have been raised. These include the difficulty of the process to be responsible for both formative and summative evaluation; the limited scope of TPAI performance indicators, the amount of time required on the part of the evaluator, linking TPAI to school improvement goals, and evaluator effectiveness. While many schools and school systems have implemented innovative alternative procedures, some issues have been difficult to resolve, including legal requirements for teacher evaluation, alternatives to TPAI, and autonomy for individual schools. A process for the development of guidelines and possible recommendations are presented, and four criteria for alternative evaluation plans are suggested (process, focus, research base, and simplicity and feasibility). Appendices provide: an outline of sample standards and procedures for developing alternative performance appraisal systems; and a copy of materials for developing an alternative teacher evaluation program as developed by Allan A. Glatthorn. (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 255

ALTERNATIVE TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN NORTH CAROLINA: Developing Guidelines

A presentation to the
N. C. Professional Practices Commission

Lynn K. Bradshaw, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
East Carolina University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January 25, 1996

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L K. Bradshaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

S1636985

The purpose of this document is to assist the members of the North Carolina Professional Practices Commission in the development of guidelines for the evaluation of teachers. A brief history of teacher performance appraisal in North Carolina will be presented, and current practice will be described. Finally, a process for determining the issues to be addressed by the Commission will be suggested. Several assumptions were stated in the Commission's rationale for the proposal to undertake this task:

- Valid assessment of teaching performance is vital to school reform.
- Significant and exciting improvements are being made in the assessment of teaching performance.
- Local officials will be given more flexibility and autonomy in the evaluation of teaching performance.
- The State has an obligation to ensure that basic standards of proper assessment are adhered to regardless of the methods used by local officials.

As the Commission develops recommendations for the State Board of Education, members may choose to revisit these assumptions.

The History of Teacher Performance Appraisal in Our State

For years, the evaluation of teacher performance was left to local districts in North Carolina. In one district in the late 60s, for example, principals used a district checklist to rate each teacher's performance. The "evaluation" became a part of the personnel file in the central office, but there was no established process for an evaluation conference or for sharing the performance checklist with each teacher. With the Tenure Act of 1971 came a need for local districts to develop methods of gathering data to support tenure decisions. The training for evaluators varied. In 1981, a statewide process for the evaluation of teacher performance was established using a checklist of assorted characteristics. Training for administrators was provided, and the process called for observations and conferences. It was followed closely by the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) which was developed, piloted, and implemented in the mid '80s.

Contributions of the TPAI

When guidelines were followed, the implementation of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument brought a number of positive changes to the way teacher performance was evaluated and to the interaction among teachers, principals, and other evaluators in the school setting.

Research-based indicators. The indicators, based upon effective teaching research, were selected only if they were associated with improved student achievement in multiple studies. The TPAI established an expectation that all teachers would be able to demonstrate a set of "essential teaching skills."

Common language on teaching effectiveness. The process established a common language on the subject of teaching effectiveness and generated a continuing dialogue about effective teaching among educators.

Observations. The TPAI process established a schedule for announced and unannounced formal classroom observations lasting a full class period. Where guidelines are followed, there has been a significant increase in the amount of time principals and other observers spent in classrooms.

Conferencing. The TPAI process established a variety of collaborative conferences between the principal and/or evaluator and the teacher. Specific feedback from a skilled observer has been a valuable source of reinforcement for effective practice.

The training packages. Initially, two training packages were developed. The Effective Teaching Training Program was designed to familiarize teachers and administrators with the effective teaching practices upon which the TPAI was based. Stipends were provided by the State for teachers who completed the program, and over a two-year period, state and local trainers provided the program for most teachers. The TPAI training package was designed for evaluators, and training was provided for principals, supervisors, and mentors who would be using the instrument.

Both training experiences introduced the language of "effective teaching" and provided staff development experiences based upon principles of adult learning--two significant accomplishments. The training-of-trainers design increased local capacity for follow-up training and growth.

Concerns about the TPAI

A number of concerns continue to be raised by teachers and administrators.

Purpose. The TPAI was designed to meet the requirements for both formative and summative evaluation. Although administrators will continue to be responsible for both types of evaluation decisions, many argue that it is difficult for one process, and one person, to respond to both purposes.

Scope. While the TPAI established a set of essential teaching skills, the indicators were not an exclusive list of effective and desirable teaching behaviors. The instrument has been viewed by many as being unresponsive to the more creative teaching approaches. The six-point lesson plan, although not required, has continued to be a "crutch" for some evaluators, and teachers have expressed concern that they are "penalized" if they happen to be formally observed when they are using other teaching models.

Time. The TPAI required a significant amount of time on the part of the evaluator, and in education, time is one of our most precious resources. As more emphasis is placed upon accountability at the school level, it will be increasingly important for the principal to maximize the use of time by linking the time spent in performance appraisal directly to school improvement goals.

Link to school improvement goals. Because the TPAI indicators are linked by research to increased student performance as measured by standardized tests, it can be argued that the TPAI process is *indirectly* related to school improvement goals. As administrators continue to meet demands for increased accountability, teacher performance appraisal practices *directly* linked to school goals could assure that the time invested in the process was clearly focused on critical improvement strategies identified at that school.

Evaluator effectiveness. Although the initial training of trainers and follow-up support for the TPAI helped establish evaluation procedures, prepare local trainers, and develop a shared language around performance evaluation, standards inevitably became diluted through new "generations" of evaluators and trainers. Variations in ratings within and across school districts tend to be associated with the level of skill of the evaluator.

Reduced state support has limited training opportunities, follow-up, and revisions in the instrument and the training packages to include current research and to reflect significant changes in school improvement planning in response to the growing emphasis upon standards for student and school performance.

Current Context for Teacher Performance Appraisal

Many schools and school systems have implemented innovative alternative procedures, but some issues have been difficult to resolve.

What Requirements Are in Place?

State law requires the annual evaluation of teachers. The TPAI is required for nontenured teachers, including initially licensed teachers, and summative ratings on the first five functions of the TPAI are the basis for the recommendation for a continuing license.

Beginning in 1989, legislation allowed local boards of education to establish alternative methods of evaluation of the performance of tenured teachers. School districts have experimented with a variety of evaluation procedures.

What Kinds of Alternatives Are in Place?

A variety of alternatives have been implemented across the State in recent years. In some cases, there has simply been an alternation in the TPAI schedule. For a number of years, the State Board had allowed a "confirming observation" (in place of the annual three-observation schedule) to be used in alternate years to evaluate the performance of tenured teachers who were at least "at standard" in all functions. Some alternatives further extend the schedule, using the confirming observation for consecutive years.

Many alternatives differ from the TPAI in more substantive ways. Several make use of a variation of a professional development plan to record a variety of performance goals and strategies and to document progress. Goals may be selected from a "menu" or established individually or for groups. Sometimes there are certain school and department or grade level goals. Additional individual goals may be established for or by each teacher. Depending on the school or system, goals may be established by school improvement teams, department personnel, grade level groups, committees, and/or

individual teachers. The level of collaboration and principal involvement also varies, but many principals view alternative performance appraisal as a significant opportunity for instructional leadership, and the description of the plan often establishes strong principal involvement.

The strength of the link to student performance data also varies. Some alternatives use projected increases in specific performance indicators when formulating goals. Others allow teachers to implement new teaching strategies to improve student performance.

The development of a professional portfolio as evidence that identified standards have been met is the basis of the Performance Based Licensure Pilot Project. Although the audience in this project consists of beginning teachers facing a licensure decision, the process could be used for the performance evaluation of fully licensed and tenured teachers. A professional portfolio is required for experienced teachers who are pursuing National Board Certification. Both projects can be expected to provide insights into possibilities for the use of portfolios in the appraisal of teaching performance.

What Concerns Exist?

Local boards have struggled with several issues. Whether to allow each school improvement team to develop its own method for teacher performance appraisal or to expect a single alternative to be developed for the entire district is closely related to other issues of site-based management. In either case, can boards be sure that alternatives will not compromise their ability to take action in the event of substandard performance?

There does exist a level of confidence in the validity of the TPAI ratings based on studies of inter-rater reliability during the initial training of trainers. A common feature of alternative methods is a provision stating that at any time there is a concern about the level of teaching performance, the principal will return to the TPAI process and use the full three-observation cycle. Many alternatives also allow the teacher to choose to "return" to the TPAI at any time. However, in dealing with possible dismissal of teachers based upon inadequate performance, local school district administrators tend to rely heavily on the advice of school board attorneys and develop formal action plans to document deficiencies and improvement efforts.

A level of comfort with the TPAI has also emerged. When considering possibilities for alternative methods of performance appraisal, both teachers and principals have expressed concerns. Some experienced teachers have become "secure" with the process and the level of their ratings, and they are hesitant to embrace an "unknown." Teachers and principals recognize that many alternatives, although more closely linked to specific school improvement efforts, could require even more time than the current system.

Training and other support for alternative performance appraisal systems is left to the local district and may or may not be in place.

A "Concept Map" for Commission Action

A process for the development of guidelines and possible recommendations are presented in Table 1. Sample documents that could support local decision-making are included in the appendices. The set of sample standards for school-based plans (see Appendix A) was adopted by a local board in 1992 and was helpful in a district where there was support for plans developed at the school level. The standards also illustrate complications caused by links to differentiated pay. A handbook, Developing an Alternative Teacher Education Program (Glatthorn, 1995), raises issues and outlines critical choices to be made by school personnel when developing alternatives (see Appendix B).

Glatthorn (1995) suggests four criteria for alternative evaluation plans. With additional language (in italics) to support the ABCs of Public Education in North Carolina, the criteria could be helpful as the Professional Practices Commission develops guidelines for consideration by the State Board of Education.

1. Process. Was the alternative system developed with systematic input from the school administrators and teachers involved?

2. Focus. Does the alternative system focus on *student outcomes in a way that supports* the professional development of teachers

3. Research Base. Does the proposed system reflect a knowledge of the research on *improving student performance* and alternative systems of teacher evaluation?

Table 1

Process for Developing Guidelines for Alternative Evaluation Plans

TASK	POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION(S)
Identify stakeholders of teacher performance appraisal and their expectations.	
Establish priorities. What should be the priority of the State Board?	Accountability: - guarantee quality learning opportunities Professionalization of teaching: - focus on role of teacher as professional decision-maker
Identify the purpose(s) of alternative performance appraisal systems.	Formative: - Allow teacher choice, encourage reflection, and include components such as peer coaching, collegial study groups, and the development of professional portfolios. Summative: - Provide defensible basis for employment and licensure decisions. provision for return to the TPAI or to establish an action plan whenever (1) there is evidence that classroom management and/or discipline techniques do not support instructional objectives or (2) learning objectives are not being met. Accountability: - Encourage direct links to student performance indicators and identified improvement goals and strategies.
Establish the locus of control (school or school system).	- Encourage local boards to develop a plan which supports SIP and maximizes the time spent in evaluation by focusing it on school improvement priorities.
Determine which components should be included in alternative performance appraisal systems.	- Conferences? When? How often? - Observations? How long? How often? - Training? For whom? By whom?
Examine existing law, policy, and guidelines to identify missing elements.	
Develop a framework for local districts to use in developing or strengthening alternative performance appraisal systems.	- See Appendix A for sample standards for school-based plans. - See Appendix B for additional suggestions developed by Glatthorn (1995).

4. Simplicity and Feasibility. Can the new system be implemented without requiring inordinate amounts of paperwork *and time* for school administrators and teachers?

Conclusions

Although some local districts are attempting to develop local procedures for the annual evaluation of teaching performance, all districts continue to use the Teacher Performance Appraisal System (TPAI) for at least some groups of teachers. However, training for teachers and administrators, resource materials, and other support for this evaluation process are no longer provided by the state education agency. Schools and districts are also "on their own" as they explore possibilities for alternative evaluation systems. With increasing emphasis on accountability for student outcomes, it is important to develop and implement performance appraisal systems which focus organizational attention on school improvement goals and strategies. The state's role in that effort needs clarification.

Sources

Glatthorn, A. 1995. Developing an Alternative Teacher Evaluation Program. Greenville, NC: East Carolina University.

Holdzkom, D. & Kuligowski, B. 1990. Alternative Teacher Performance Appraisal: A Workshop Prepared for Presentation in Regional Centers in North Carolina.

Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L., Editors. 1990. The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary Teachers. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stufflebeam, D. 1988. The Personnel Evaluation Standards. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

APPENDIX A
Sample Standards for the Development of Alternative Performance Appraisal Systems

- Alternative performance appraisal systems will demonstrate commitment to the rigorous and continuous evaluation of employee performance.

- Alternative performance appraisal systems will be directly linked to student outcomes and school improvement goals.

- Alternative performance appraisal systems will be developed with input from affected employees.

- Proposals for alternative performance appraisal systems will include the following components:

A. **RATIONALE**
   1. Why is an alternative to the TPAI needed?
   2. What are the expected results of the alternative system:

B. **LINK TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**
   1. How will the proposed alternative directly support increased student performance and the accomplishment of school improvement goals?

C. **TARGET GROUP**
   1. Who will be involved in the development of the alternative?
   2. How will participants be selected?
   3. What are the conditions for returning to the TPAI?

D. **PROCESS**
   1. What activities will take place and what will be the timeline--development of goals, use of student performance data, observations, conferences, documentation, and summative evaluation?

E. **LINK TO DIFFERENTIATED PAY**
   1. If TPAI performance is a component of the school's differentiated pay plan, what will be the impact of the alternative performance appraisal system, and how will issues be resolved?

F. **EVALUATION**
   How will the effectiveness of the alternative be evaluated?

APPENDIX B
Developing an Alternative Teacher Evaluation Program

NOTE: These materials were developed by Allan A. Glatthorn (1995) to support the work of local school personnel and are included in this document with permission of the author. A Distinguished Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at East Carolina University, Dr. Glatthorn is an author of numerous books and other publications in the area of curriculum and instruction, supervision, and teacher development.

1. GUIDELINES IN DEVELOPING AN ALTERNATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Educators interested in developing an alternative teacher evaluation system are strongly encouraged to proceed. To assist them in this process, these materials have been developed from a review of the relevant literature (identified in the references) and from the author's experiences. This first section suggests some guidelines that might be followed; the second section, the issues to resolve.

1. Begin by establishing the parameters or limits for the system.

The superintendent should identify any constraints applying to the new system that have been set by the board or central administration. The development team should review the state regulations pertaining to alternative systems.

2. Assure comprehensive involvement from the outset.

Any system will be stronger if it has benefited from considerable input from school administrators and the teachers involved. As you identify the process you will use, make systematic provisions for such involvement.

3. Use a systematic process in developing the new system.

Any systematic process will work. Here in brief form is one that would seem useful.

- The appropriate administrator should inform all administrators and teachers of the project and its goals.
- The superintendent should identify the parameters.
- A small team should review the issues, make tentative decisions about them, and formulate those tentative decisions into Draft 1 of the alternative system.
- Draft 1 should be reviewed in depth at an open meeting at which all present are invited to provide input.
- The developers should use the input to develop a revised version, Draft 2, that seems to represent a consensus of all those involved.

- Draft 2 should be submitted to the superintendent for his or her review, with revisions incorporated into Draft 3, to be submitted to the board for their review.

4. Keep in mind the criteria for effective systems.

The criteria listed in Figure 1 should be helpful as you and your colleagues develop your own system.

Figure 1
Criteria for Alternative Systems

1	**Process**	Was the alternative system developed with systematic input from the school administrators and teachers involved?
2	**Focus**	Does the alternative system focus on the professional development of teachers, instead of emphasizing numerical ratings and scores?
3	**Research Base**	Does the proposed system reflect a knowledge of the research on alternative systems of teacher evaluation?
4	**Simplicity and Feasibility**	Can the new system be implemented without requiring inordinate amounts of paperwork for school administrators and teachers?

5. Provide adequate support for the new system.

The new system will work effectively only if it has received adequate support. That support includes active professional support from the board, the superintendent, and the school administrators. It also includes the provision of the needed staff development for school administrators and teachers.

2. ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A FRAMEWORK FOR AN ALTERNATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

The framework that follows has been developed by reviewing the literature on teacher evaluation systems (the most important listed at the end of this paper) and integrating that review with the author's experiences in evaluating educational personnel. The components of the framework are posed as issues that need to be examined; in each case the issue is noted, the options are indicated, a recommendation is made, and space is provided for your tentative decision.

1. Which personnel will be involved in the alternative system: all personnel; all personnel other than beginning teachers; tenured teachers; all tenured teachers other than those identified by the principal as needing remediation.

   Recommendation: All personnel other than beginning and non-tenured teachers.

   Your decision:

2. What level of consistency will be required throughout the district: one system for all schools; options for individual schools within district guidelines; individual school models without district constraints.

   Recommendation: Options for individual schools within district guidelines.

   Your decision:

3. What will be the evaluation schedule: annual evaluation for all teachers; evaluation activities scheduled on multi-year cycles.

   Recommendation: Thorough evaluation once every three years, with minimal involvement in the "off" years.

   Your decision:

4. Will the proposed alternative make use of specific lists of teaching skills: use TPAI skills checklist; use skills identified by teams; use no specific list of skills.

   Recommendation: Use skills identified by teams.

   Your decision:

5. Will personnel be expected to develop written plans for professional growth: specific and detailed plans required; general plans required; written plans made optional.

   Recommendation: General plans required.

Your decision:

6. Will professional growth plans need to be linked with school improvement plans: all plans must be directly related to school improvement; plans are expected to relate generally to school improvement plans, with exceptions permitted if approved by the principal; no requirements for such linkage.

   Recommendation: Plans are expected to relate generally school improvement plans, with exceptions permitted if approved by the principal.

   Your decision:

7. Will professional growth plans be required to include goals: specific measurable goals required; general goals required; no goals required.

   Recommendation: General goals required.

   Your decision:

8. Will plans require classroom observations: all plans must specify minimum number of observations; plans should specify observations if they will be useful in assessing growth; no observations required.

   Recommendation: Plans should specify observations if they will be useful in assessing growth.

   Your decision:

9. Will plans emphasize self-directed development (the teacher works independently on his or her own growth) or cooperative development (the teacher works with a small group of colleagues): self-directed; cooperative; options provided to teachers.

   Recommendation: Options provided, with encouragement to use cooperative development.

   Your decision:

10. Will the plan make use of self-evaluation: self-evaluation required; self-evaluation recommended; no self-evaluation.

    Recommendation: Self-evaluation required.

    Your decision:

11. Will the plan make use of student feedback: student feedback required; student feedback optional; no student feedback.

    Recommendation: Student feedback optional.

    Your decision:

12. Will the plan make use of peer observation and evaluation: peer observation and evaluation required; peer observation of a non-evaluative type strongly recommended; no peer observation.

    Recommendation: Non-evaluative peer-observation strongly recommended.

    Your decision:

13. Will the plan make use of student test results: student test results required; student test results optional; no student test results.

    Recommendation: Student test results optional.

    Your decision:

14. Who will be the final evaluator: self; peers; school administrator.

    Recommendation: School administrator.

    Your decision:

15. Will there be a standard rating scale for all teachers: a rating scale should be incorporated in all improvement plans; rating scales should be incorporated as appropriate; rating scales should not be included.

    Recommendation: Rating scales should be included as appropriate.

    Your decision:

16. What activities might be pursued as growth activities: graduate courses; regional, district, and school staff development; special conferences and workshops; curriculum development; action research; materials development; professional readings and dialogs.

    Recommendation: Any activity is allowed as long as it can be demonstrated to contribute towards professional growth.

    Your decision:

17. How will the teacher demonstrate achievement: portfolio; annual written report; live or taped demonstration.

Recommendation: Any means that will enable the teacher to demonstrate achievement will be acceptable. The use of portfolios is strongly recommended.

Your decision:

18. Will conferences with the administrator be required: three conferences required (beginning, middle, and end); one final conference required; no conference required.

Recommendation: One final conference required.

Your decision:

19. May a teacher involved in the alternative system be assigned to the TPAI standard system: at the principal's discretion; at the principal's discretion with full documentation; no reassignment.

Recommendation: At principal's discretion with full documentation.

Your decision:

REFERENCES

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1992). Teacher development and educational change. Washington, DC: Falmer.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1992). Teachers as agents of change: A new look at school improvement. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. G. (1992). Understanding teacher development. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). The new handbook of teacher evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stiggins, R. J. & Duke, D. (1988). The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation. Albany: SUNY Press.